

children any longer. The Internet is quickly causing community boundaries to disappear, and we have learned that it is no longer enough to focus our efforts on the local level. We must ensure that children are safe not only at home and at school, but also as they continue to explore the exciting new world of cyber-space. H.R. 3494 provides the strong protections required to combat the unconscionable and indefensible actions of pedophiles and sexual predators, wherever they may occur, and I will proudly vote for its passage.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Child Protection and Sexual Predator Punishment Act of 1998. This bill, if passed, will further expand the authority of this country's national police force and further "justify" the federal Justice Department's intrusion into mail, telephone and Internet communications.

Mr. Chairman, today the Congress will collectively move our nation yet another step closer to a national police state by further expanding the notion of federal crimes and paving the way for a deluge of federal criminal justice activity. Of course, it is much easier to ride the current wave of federally "criminalizing" all human malfeasance in the name of saving the world from some evil than to uphold a Constitutional oath which prescribes a process by which the nation is protected from what is perhaps the worst evil, totalitarianism. Who, after all, and especially in an election year, wants to be amongst those members of Congress who are portrayed as soft on child-related sexual crime irrespective of the procedural transgressions and individual or civil liberties one tramples in their zealous approach.

In the name of the politically popular cause of protecting children against sex crimes, the Members of Congress will vote on whether to move the Nation further down the path of centralized-Government implosion by appropriating yet more Federal taxpayer money and brandishing more U.S. prosecutors at whatever problem happens to be brought to the floor by any Members of Congress hoping to gain political favor with those embracing some politically popular cause. The Child Protection and Sexual Predator Punishment Act of 1998 is no exception.

Who, after all, can stand on the house floor and oppose a bill which is argued to make the world safer for children with respect to crimes? It is a sad commentary when members of this body only embrace or even mention federalism when it serves their own political purposes and, at the same time, consciously ignore federalism's implications for these politically popular causes. It seems to no longer even matter whether governmental programs actually accomplish their intended goals or have any realistic hope of solving problems. No longer does the end even justify the means. All that now seems to matter is that Congress pass a new law.

Crimes committed against children (as well as adults) are a problem that should concern all Americans. As a doctor of obstetrics I have enjoyed the privilege of bringing more than 3,000 new lives into the world. I know there are few things more tragic than crimes committed against young people. In fact, the types of crimes this bill attempts to federally punish are among the most despicable criminal acts committed. Undoubtedly, strong measures and penalties need to be imposed to deter and

punish these criminal actors. Nevertheless, the threshold question in Congress must always be: "under what authority do we act?" Should we cease to concern ourselves about the Constitution in all that we do and moved by emotion speak only of vague theoretical outcomes?

Any federal usurpation of criminal law, no matter how flexible, violates the 10th amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The 10th amendment limits the Federal Government to those functions explicitly enumerated in the Constitution. Other than in these few areas, the States are sovereign. Therefore the Federal Government has no authority to federalize crimes whether committed against children, women, or some specific race. Additionally, ours is an individual Bill of Rights rather than a system of rights dependent upon to which group (gender, race, or age) one happens to belong.

The drafters of the Bill of Rights knew quite well that it would be impossible for a central government to successfully manage crime prevention programs for as large and diverse a country as America. The founders also understood that centralized federal involvement in crime prevention and control was dangerous and would lead to a loss of precious liberty. The bill's implication of federal monitoring of conversation on phone lines, the Internet, and U.S. mail is frightening and opens the door to unlimited government snooping.

Some will argue that federal legislation is necessary because communications cross state lines. Fortunately, the Constitution provides for the procedural means for preserving the integrity of state sovereignty over those issues delegated to it via the tenth amendment. The privilege and immunities clause as well as full faith and credit clause allow states to exact judgments from those who violate their state laws. The Constitution even allows the federal government to legislatively preserve the procedural mechanisms which allow states to enforce their substantive laws without the federal government imposing its substantive edicts on the states. Article IV, Section 2, Clause 2 makes provision for the rendition of fugitives from one state to another and in 1783 Congress passed an act which did exactly this.

I too find most despicable the criminal acts this bill attempts to make federal crimes, but under the U.S. Constitution criminal law jurisdiction lies with the States. This is why I oppose yet another step toward a national police state. And because I fear the bill's implications regarding federal monitoring of voice, mail and data communications, I cannot support H.R. 3494.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I stand today in strong support of the Conyers Amendment. The provisions in this amendment will strengthen the Child Protection & Sexual Predator Punishment Act and help us continue our work to combat domestic violence.

Every nine seconds, as we stand here on the House floor, another woman will be physically abused. Three-quarters of these women will be assaulted by someone they know. It is impossible for us to know how many cases of this appalling crime go unreported.

The Violence Against Women Act has helped us to combat this problem by providing grants to states to help set up rape crisis hotlines, counseling programs, and professional training for police officers to help them recognize and deal with domestic violence.

The Conyers Amendment will strengthen the Violence Against Women Act. It contains provisions to help limit the effects of violence on children, to help prevent sexual assault from ever happening, and to protect women who have been the victims of domestic violence.

Mr. Speaker, when we pass the Child Protection and Sexual Predator Punishment Act, Congress will be taking a tremendous step to protect our children from harm that could come to them over the Internet.

We must also pass the Conyers Amendment, to protect them and their mothers from harm at home. Let's commit ourselves to ending domestic violence so that women and children are safe in their own homes. Vote yes on the Conyers Amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3494, the "Child Protection and Sexual Predator Punishment Act of 1998."

Our nation's children are our most precious resource. H.R. 3494 will ensure that children are protected from pedophiles and sexual predators while continuing to protect them as they expand their minds and explore the Internet. The Child Protection and Sexual Predator Punishment Act will toughen penalties for sexual predators, ensuring that they are held accountable for their actions.

This bill will not only make our Internet safe for our children's young minds, but safer for their young lives. The stories of children being lured away from their homes and parents to be murdered by pedophiles are haunting. Nearly two-thirds of the prisoners serving time for rape and sexual assault victimized children, and almost one third of those victims were less than 11 years old. These are alarming numbers.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3494. We must show these offenders that we will not stand for the abuse and murder of our nation's children.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I'm proud to rise in support of this legislation today. I'm especially pleased with the lengths to which this bill goes in punishing those who utilize the Internet to prey on our children.

The great need for protecting children from Internet-based crimes was reinforced to me last fall when Deborah Boehle (*Bay-Lee*), the mother of a 9-year-old girl, met with me in my Batavia, IL, office.

Mrs. Boehle explained to me the hardship which her family endured because of an incident on the Internet, and which then led her to move her family into my district from their home in Juliet, IL.

At the time, my colleague, JERRY WELLER was moving quickly to address this incident legislatively, and I am proud that I was able to work with him and Chairman MCCOLLUM in addressing this ever-increasing problem.

The culmination of those efforts is this legislation which establishes fines, and sets prison sentences of up to 5 years for individuals using the Internet to facilitate the contact of a minor for illegal sexual activity.

Just like those who recklessly drive on our roadways and pose a danger to the traveling public, we have to pull over and lock up those criminals who are abusing the information superhighway. Although the Internet is by and large used for well-intentioned purposes, we have to be mindful of those twisted individuals who want to use it as a vehicle to threaten our children and their families.

As we've seen in northern Illinois, crimes against our kids over the Internet can and do